

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-17, as amended, remain in this application for the Examiner's review and consideration. The claims have been amended to correct informalities and to more clearly define the scope of protection sought by the present application. In particular, claims 1 and 9 have been amended to recite that the second portion of the initial set of search results are ranked based on in-links associated with each search result in the second portion of the search results and a creation date for each in-link associated with each search result to generate the temporally ranked set of search results. Claim 15 was amended to recite that the temporally ranked set of search results utilizes an age associated with in-links to each result in the set of search results to rank the search results. Support for these amendments can be found in the specification as originally filed and in particular on page 3, line 12, page 4, line 5, page 8, lines 26-29 and page 13, lines 11-12. As these amendments do not introduce any new matter into the above identified application, their entry at this time is warranted.

Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14 were objected to for informalities as specified in paragraph 2 of the final Office Action. Applicant asserts that the present amendments correct these informalities. Therefore, this objection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5, 7-12 and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0135490 to Barrett et al. ("Barrett") for the reasons stated in paragraph 2 of the Office Action. It was asserted that Barrett discloses the present invention as currently recited in the claims including generating an initial set of search results and ranking at least a portion of the search results based on temporal factors. Applicant asserts that this rejection has been overcome for the reasons that follow.

Barrett is directed to an enhanced popularity ranking in which the search activities of previous users are monitored, and this activity is used to organize information for future users. The user activities are monitored from a time and use based perspective. The basic technique of Barrett is to utilize the time history of uses of information. Therefore a popularity ranking is used based upon timing of previous uses.

In contrast, methods for ranking results in accordance with the present invention and as currently recited claims 1, 9 and 15, the only independent claims, are based upon in-links

associated with each search result and the age of these in-links. These in-links provide an indication of the quality of the data or website returned in response to a query. As stated in the specification, "the age or date of a given result . . . can be based on . . . the dates on which the result is referenced or linked to by others, i.e., the dates that each in-link is created" page 8, lines 26-29. Since higher quality resources will have more overall in-links and recent as well as older in-links, an evaluation of the age of in-links provides an assessment of the quality of a given search result. Search results ranked based on in-links and the age of these in-links are ranked based on quality and trustworthiness of the data contained therein. The time history of uses in Barrett is not in-link data and does not utilize the existence or age of in-links to a given search result. The history of uses is based upon how often, when and for how long a given result or webpage is viewed. As currently recited in claims 1 and 9, an initial set of search results is generated, and two portions of this set of search results are identified, a first portion and a second portion based upon the creation dates of each result. The first portion of the initial search results has creation dates after a pre-determined threshold date, and the second portion of the initial search results has creation dates before the pre-determined threshold date. The second portion results, i.e. the results having creation dates before the threshold date, are ranked based on the in-links and the age of these in-links associated with each search result. There is no teaching or suggestion in Barrett of making any rankings based upon in-link data. Moreover, Barrett fails to teach or disclose first sorting search results into two groups based upon age followed by ranking the search results based on in-link data.

All of the remaining claims depend either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 9 and 15 and contain additional recitations that further define the present invention over Barrett. For example, claims 3 and 10 recited the use of present importance weight and future importance weight in ranking the results in the second portion of the initial results. Since Barrett fails to disclose or teach all of the recitations of the claims as presently amended, the present rejection has been overcome and should be withdrawn.


Applicant asserts that all claims are now in condition for allowance, early notification of which is respectfully requested. A petition for a one month extension of time for the filing of this submission and a Request for Continuing Examination along with the prescribed fee is

enclosed herewith. In addition, payment of the prescribed fee for the submission of a Request for Continuing Examination is included concurrently with the filing of this submission. As the present amendments do not introduce any new claims above the original number of filed claims, no fees are believed due for the submission of this amendment. No other fees are believed due.

Respectfully submitted,

Date May 29, 2007

---



---

George Willingham (Reg No. 41,371)  
Attorney for Applicant  
P.O. Box 19080  
Baltimore, MD 21284  
410-832-8801